

Message

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: 10/17/2016 7:46:49 PM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: REVIEW/COMMENT - Draft response to SF Magazine Reporter

Dear John,

In followup to Michele's email last Friday, here is a clean version of the language I worked out with her for review by you and Angeles. Please let me know any comments:

The site-specific information for Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is that the Navy is installing a protective cover over the whole site and that future occupants will only be allowed to grow plants (including those that would be eaten) in raised beds. However, even if the PRG is calculated at the default level, the Navy's cleanup still brings radiation to levels within the protective range.

From: Huitric, Michele
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2016 1:10 PM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Yogi, David <Yogi.David@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>
Cc: Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>
Subject: NEW: Media query: SF Magazine - Additional Hunters Point questions

Hi all ~

The SF Magazine reporter is now asking, "Can you tell me what the site-specific information is that I omitted from the EPA's PRG calculator?"

I'm checking to see if he has a specific deadline, but I'm sure he would appreciate by tomorrow, if possible.

Thanks,
Michele

For context, here's the previous responses already sent:

Question: Do you know if the EPA gave the City and County of SF a response to the formal letter city leaders sent on 9/19? A copy is attached. Do we know if city officials received the briefing?

Response: EPA is working with the Mayor's office to set up a briefing.

Question: Does EPA know which agencies are investigating the data given to the Navy by Tetra Tech?

Response: EPA is aware of an investigation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (described here: <http://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1621/ML16211A133.pdf>) and another by the Navy. Here is contact information for both groups:

- Diane Screnci, NRC public affairs officer: 610-337-5330
- William Franklin, Navy public affairs officer, (619) 524-5433, william.d.franklin@navy.mil.

Question: I have a question regarding the preliminary remediation goals in the HPNS cleanup and the PRGs I saw online using the EPA's own calculator at <https://epa-prgs.ornl.gov/radionuclides/>. It looks like the PRGs in the HPNS cleanup standards and the PRGs on the EPA's website are different. Attached for your convenience is a page from the HPNS

basewide cleanup memo, and the PRGs for the same radionuclides of concern from the EPA's own calculator. Can you help me explain why they are different? It appears the levels of radionuclides allowed in the table in the basewide RAD memo are higher than in the EPA's PRG calculator.

Response: The PRG calculator can be used with either default values or values that have been tailored with site-specific information. The PRG Users Guide (https://epa-prgs.ornl.gov/radionuclides/prg_guide.html) recommends modifying the default values using site-specific information, where available, to calculate a more realistic estimate of risk. It appears that you have used default values in your calculations, which would explain the discrepancies. In addition, Superfund regulations in the National Contingency Plan have defined the protective range of excess cancer risk as a probability that a person exposed to radioactive and chemical contaminants will have an additional one in ten thousand to a one in a million chance of developing cancer (technically known as the 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} cancer risk range). Your calculations do not reflect this complete range.

Lily Lee
Cleanup Project Manager
Superfund Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518
www.epa.gov/region9/superfund